APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/862,814	05/21/2001	John C. Seibel	068082.0114	1151

			EXAMINER
31625 7590 02/26/2004			LU, KUEN S

BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
PATENT DEPARTMENT
98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500
AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 02/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.		Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/862,814		SEIBEL ET AL.
	Examiner		Art Unit
	Kuen S Lu		2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/19/2003*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-18* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-4,6-13,15-18* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
       application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *7*.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1.   Claims 1-4, 6-13 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as as being unpatentable

over Thomas (U.S. Patent 6,401,118) and in view of Pizano et al. (U.S. Patent 6,105,055,

hereafter "Pizano").

As per claims 1 and 10, Thomas teaches "a web archive database for storing text

sources retrieved by the crawler" at Fig. 3, element 312 and col. 9, lines 54-55 by

archiving all web pages to storage media of file system;

"a harvester process for searching the web archive database for contact data for

prospective contacts of the product/service provider" at Fig. 3, element 308, col. 6,

lines 31-39 and 54-58, and col. 9, lines 8-10 by defining search criteria, performing the

search, returning a list of URLs, visiting the URL, downloading the content and scoring

the individual pages on the basis of search criteria;

"a web crawler process operable to receive parameter data to locate participant-based

text sources selected from the group of: newsgroups, discussion forums, mailing lists,

and web sites" at col. 6, lines 54-62 by using URLs as parameter for locating the

content pages from the web site.

Thomas does not specifically teach reverse lookup process or crawling to other text sources.

However, Pizano teaches crawling to newsgroup server or conference database at Fig. 5, elements 20, 21 and 24, and "a reverse lookup process for receiving contact data from the harvester process and for performing a reverse lookup from the contact data" at col. 4, lines 55-64 by performing the following steps as a reverse lookup process: (1) Connecting to the newsgroup server, (2) Retrieving headers of previous postings, (3) Selecting a specific message for review and (4) Once the message is identified, downloading its contents.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Pizano's teaching with Thomas' by expanding the sources Thomas' system can crawl, harvest and perform reverse backup because by doing so the search data set of Thomas' system would have been more inclusive and the system would have been able to serve a much wider of audience.

As per claims 2 and 11, Thomas teaches "... process that links the prospects to related business information" at col. 14, lines 46-50 by a database thread to recognize and extract data from web pages in order to later generate the client's final report.

As per claims 3 and 12, Thomas teaches "the step of using a value-add process is performed on line" at Figs. 4-5 by the database thread processes steps 310, 314-320 for generating the client's report on-line.

As per claims 4 and 13, Thomas teaches "the step of using a value-add process is performed off line" at Figs. 4-5 by the database thread processes steps 310, 312-320 for generating the client's report off-line.

As per claims 6 and 15, Pizano further teaches "reverse lookup is performed offline by accessing a database" at col. 4, lines 55-64 by performing the following steps as a reverse lookup process: (1) Connecting to the newsgroup server, (2) Retrieving headers of previous postings, (3) Selecting a specific message for review and (4) Once the message is identified, downloading its contents.

As per claims 7 and 16, Pizano further teaches "the reverse lookup is performed online by accessing a database the Internet" at col. 4, lines 55-64 by performing the following steps as a reverse lookup process: (1) Connecting to the newsgroup server, (2) Retrieving headers of previous postings, (3) Selecting a specific message for review and (4) Once the message is identified, downloading its contents.

As per claims 8 and 17, Thomas teaches "an indexer process that indexes documents retrieved by the crawler process for access by the harvester process" at col. 14, line 58 – line col. 15, line 3 where archive thread uses time-stamp to index documents retrieved by the crawler process.

As per claims 9 and 18, Thomas teaches "a mailer process for scripting correspondence to the prospective customers" at col. 14, lines 42-50 by the database thread for extracting data from pages to generate client's report containing client's electronic mail address.

2.   The prior art made of record

A. U.S. Patent No.   6401118

B. U.S. Patent No.   6105055

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

C. U.S. Pub. No.   2002/0072982A1

D. U.S. Patent No.   6510432

E. U.S. Patent No.   6282548

F. U.S. Patent No.   6480885

G. U.S. Pub. No.   2002/0032725A1

H. U.S. Pub. No.   2002/0107701A1

I. U.S. Pub. No.   2002/0032603A1

J. U.S. Pub. No.   2002/0143870A1

K. U.S. Pub. No.   2001/0052003A1

L. U.S. Pub. No.   2002/0073058A1

M. U.S. Pub. No.   2002/0161685A1

Conclusion

Response to Arguments

3.   The Applicants' arguments filed on December 19, 2003 have been fully considered.

In responding to Applicants' amendments made to the specification, independent and

dependent claims, the Examiner has created this final office action.

Regarding Page 11, lines 4-5 and 8-10, Applicants argued "In Thomas, the search

locates a website containing certain content. The contact data is the URL of the website

located in the search and the contact is the owner of the URL" and "In the present

invention, data found by the harvester is the same data used for the reverse lookup. For

example, a prospective contact's telephone number could be used to obtain additional

contact information".

As to the above arguments, the Examiner recites the references of Thomas and

Pizano for teaching reverse lookup on the data which harvester harvests the newsgroup

server to retrieve headers and then selects specific message for review by identifying

and downloading the selected message. Please refer to the rationale for rejecting

Claims 1 and 10 in Item 1 above in the office action.

4.   As discussed above, the U.S.C 102 rejection for Claims 1-4, 6-13 and 15-18 is

hereby sustained.

Conclusions

5.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.**

The Applicants are reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR

1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until

after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened

statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension

fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory

action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX

MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6.   The prior art made of record, listed on form PTO-892, and not relied upon, if any, is

considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

   If a reference indicated as being mailed on PTO-FORM 892 has not been enclosed in

this action, please contact Lisa Craney whose telephone number is (703) 305-9601 for

faster service.

   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 703-305-4894.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

KL

Patent Examiner

February 19, 2004

JOHN BREENE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100